

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 1031 10/081,422 02/22/2002 47168-00216 David M. Prestipino EXAMINER 30223 08/19/2005 7590 JENKENS & GILCHRIST, P.C. LEWIS, RALPH A 225 WEST WASHINGTON ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER **SUITE 2600** CHICAGO, IL 60606 3732

DATE MAILED: 08/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	1
ν	,

Advisory Action

Applicant(s)		
PRESTIPINO, DAVID M.		
Art Unit		
3732		

Potoro the Eiling of an Annual Priof				
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Ralph A. Lewis	3732		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress	
THE REPLY FILED <u>25 July 2005</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.				
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejecti	on.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origi r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri inally set in the final Offi	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as	
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th		
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief,	will not be entered b	ecause	
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);				
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		ected claims.		
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).	
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the	
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		ll be entered and an e	explanation of	
Claim(s) allowed Claim(s) objected to:				
Claim(s) rejected:				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:				
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome all rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fai	ils to provide a	
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attack	ned.	
 The request for reconsideration has been considered buit is not found persuasive. See attachment 	at does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowa	nce because:	
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)		
13. Other:				
		Ralph A. Lewis	<u>۔</u>	
		Primary Examine	r	
		Au3732		

Advisory Comments

Applicant request for reconsideration has been carefully considered, but has not been found persuasive.

Applicant argues that there is no reasonable suggestion or motivation in the entire teachings of the applied references to develop an implant analog that mimics the implant's configuration below the implant's upper surface. The examiner strongly disagrees, Lazarra et al teach an implant that includes an upper groove 14 that is intended to be positioned above the surface of the bone when it has reached a "steady state" after about eighteen months (column 3, line 11). The steady state bone surface level will generally occur between lines 30 and 32 (column 3, lines 15 and 16). Which is below the upper groove 14. Accordingly, when the ordinarily skilled artisan went to make a model of the Lazzara et al jaw with implant according to the prior art teachings of Beaty et al, said ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to place an upper groove in a Beaty et al type analog so as to imitate the above bone surface groove 14 of Lazzara et al so that an accurate and cosmetically pleasing prosthesis may be formed.

Applicant argues that one wouldn't know where the steady state condition will occur. While applicant may be technically correct, Lazzara does teach that it will generally occur between lines 30 and 32 which is below the upper groove 14.

Applicant further argues that the designed prosthesis will never extend below the upper surface of the implant so there is no need to mimic the prior art implant structure of Lazzara et al (i.e. the upper groove 14) that is below the upper surface of the implant.

Application/Control Number: 10/081,422

Art Unit: 3732

The examiner disagrees, one would be motivated to make the model of the jaw/implant

as accurate as possible so that when the prosthesis is designed by the technician it is

done so on a model that looks as close as possible to the patient's mouth. The more

accurate the model, then the more accurately and cosmetically pleasing will be the

designed prosthesis.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to **Ralph Lewis** at telephone number **(571) 272-4712.** Fax (571) 273-8300. The examiner works a compressed work schedule and is unavailable every other Friday. The examiner's

supervisor, Kevin Shaver, can be reached at (571) 272-4720.

R.Lewis August 10, 2005

Raiph A. Lewis
Primary Examiner

Page 3

AU3732